

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,527	02/21/2002	David P. Rossum	017002-003890US	9363
8791	7590 03/25/2004		EXAM	INER
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR			WARREN, DAVID S	
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		2837	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/080,527	ROSSUM, DAVID P.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David S. Warren	2837			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron tte, cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11.	December 2003.				
<u> </u>	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 14-38 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest 5) Claim(s) 14-24 and 36-38 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 25-35 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and the subject to restrict the subjec	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 21 February 2002 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to be added to	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objectore drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documer 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documer 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)		(070, 440)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2837

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14 – 24 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding claim 14, the prior art (including those patents with a common assignee) does not show a sampling instrument with both linear interpolation and asynchronous memory access operation. Regarding claims 18, 19, and 36, the prior art does not show the use of linear interpolation with the use of bus request and acknowledge signals used within a memory access unit.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain <u>a</u> patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2837

Claims 25, 27 – 33, and 35 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 - 31 of U.S. Patent No. 5,925,841. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: Regarding claims 25 and 33, U.S. Patent No. 5925841 (hereinafter, '841), shows the use of a cache memory storing at least N waveform memory samples for each channel (claim 20, lines 61 and 62), control logic to access the waveform memory samples from the cache memory (claim 4, line 64; the examiner considers "control logic to access ... waveform memory " to be equivalent to "a cache controller to access ... waveform memory"), and an interpolator to perform Nth order interpolation to perform interpolation on the waveform memory samples (claim 18, lines 56 – 58). Regarding claims 27 and 35, the '841 patent discloses both the bus request and bus acknowledge signals (claim 1, lines 35 – 39). Regarding claim 28, the '841 patent discloses a memory address and control signal capable of being output disabled in response too a bus acknowledge signal (claim 2). Regarding claim 29, '841 discloses a shared bus coupling said digital sampling instrument to a waveform memory (claim 17). Regarding claim 30, the '841 document shows the use of overwriting data (see claim 5). Regarding claim 31, see claim 6 of '841. Regarding claim 32, see claim 7 of '841.

Claims 25, 26, 33, and 34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 - 8 of U.S.

Page 4

Patent No. 6,365,816. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: Regarding claims 25 and 33, U.S. Patent No. 6,365,816 (hereinafter, '816), shows the use of a cache memory storing at least N waveform memory samples for each channel (claim 6, lines 47 and 48), control logic to access the waveform memory samples from the cache memory (claim 1, lines 9 - 12; the examiner considers "control logic to access ... waveform memory " to be equivalent to "a memory access unit"), and an interpolator to perform Nth order interpolation to perform interpolation on the waveform memory samples (claim 6, lines 41 – 44). Regarding claims 26 and 34, the '816 reference discloses a memory access unit (claim 6, line 51), an address update unit (claim 6, line 49) and asynchronous operation (claim 6, lines 57 and 58).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David S. Warren whose telephone number is 571-272-2076. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30 A.M. to 6:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Nappi can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 37. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/080,527 Page 5

Art Unit: 2837

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dsw

ROBERT NAPPI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER